DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 234 HE 006 134

TITLE	Dimensions of Postsecondary Educational Planning: The "University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978" As A Case Study.
INSTITUTION	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Planning; *Post Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*California; University of California Academic Plan 1974 1978

ABSTRACT

The stimulation of a wide-ranging conversation about California postsecondary education is a critical function of the Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education. One of the more significant topics of this conversation is planning, which is discussed in this essay. First, a framework for considering the planning process is sketched. This framework includes the context for planning in the 1970's and some suggested characteristics of the planning process. Second, the recent "University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978," is discussed in light of this framework. (A summary of this plan is included in the appendix.) Approved by the Board of Regents in March 1974, this plan is important on two fronts. The individual campus plans will be developed in consonance with this segmental effort; and the new Postsecondary Education Commission, with the charge of comprehensive planning, must mesh the various segmental plans into a coherent statewide vision. (Author/PG)

ED100234

Dimensions of Postsecondary Educational Planning:

The "University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978"

As A Case Study

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Staff Paper

Prepared for

Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education

California Legislature

August, 1974

HE 006 134

INTRODUCTION

The stimulation of a wide-ranging conversation about California postsecondary education is a critical function of the Joint Committee on Postsecondary Education. One of the more significant topics of this conversation should be planning--the capacity of governmental structures, segments, and institutions to systematically and creatively design futures for themselves which are in harmony with human, individual and societal needs.

This essay discusses planning. First, a framework for considering the planning process is sketched. This framework includes the context for planning in the 1970's and some suggested characteristics of the planning process. Second, the recent University of California Academic Plan, 1974-1978, is discussed in light of this framework. (A summary of this plan is included in an appendix.) Approved by the Board of Regents in March, 1974, this plan will be important on two fronts. The individual campus plans will be developed in consonance with this segmental effort; and the new Postsecondary Education Commission, with the overriding charge of comprehensive planning, must mesh the various segmental plans into a coherent statewide vision.

We believe that cooperative planning will be a major challenge to all of postsecondary education in the coming years. Historically, state

governments and institutions of higher education have often been critical of each other's assumptions, policies, and actions. Particularly in academic planning, agencies with statewide responsibilities and academic institutions with frequently different concerns must become increasingly sensitive to each other. Perhaps real planning--with implementation--is impossible. We hope not and think not. But to make it work, we must continue the dialogue.

A FRAMEWORK FOR ACADEMIC PLANNING

Current Conditions for Academic Planning

There are two interrelated dimensions of the general situation in which planners of higher education find themselves:

- Quantitative dimension. Enrollment curves which bent sharply upward fifteen years ago are steadily becoming flatter and will be sloping significantly downward, perhaps into the 1990's. Beyond purely demographic factors, it appears that participation rates in higher education within the traditional age group are also dropping. As both the market value of the college degree and life-styles continue to change, the latter trend--related to participation rates--may be the most unpredictable and yet significant.

- Qualitative dimension. Having witnessed widespread student dissent and the increasing willingness to criticize social institutions, a growing number of individuals both inside and outside colleges and universities are vigorously questioning the fundamental operating principles of academic institutions. State officials and members of the general public are among those asking questions which cannot be answered by traditional academic dogma.

The interaction of these dimensions creates a serious fiscal problem, since leveling enrollments often result in leveling appropriations for higher education. In addition, decision-makers' interests will shift to more qualitative questions.

Legislators increasingly view higher education as merely one other social institution among a growing number of important ones--all of which are now subject to much closer scrutiny by legislatures and state agencies.

The belief that the character of the educational experience must not be determined solely by traditional educators means that issues formerly settled within the academic community are quickly becoming matters of public policy. This policy is likely to diverge from that made by institutional administrators because of the multitude of diverse constituencies which have recently emerged and to which legislators are responsive.

There are, moreover, several broader societal trends which affect both the context in which academic institutions operate and the characteristics of entering students:

- There is occurring an increasing recognition and sensitivity to diversity in values, lifestyles, career patterns, and cultures. More and more, many agree that there are diverse areas, ways, and places in which to learn.

- There continues to be strong concern among young people for social problems and an emphasis on gaining competencies to help address these problems.

- The society appears to be increasingly tolerant of dissent and of open discussion of policy issues and existing assumptions. Questioning of traditional values and institutions is accepted and is considered by many to be healthy.

- Many individuals appear to be increasingly concerned with understanding themselves and developing meaningful relationships with others. Particularly among the young, institutions are seen as rigid and sterile structures which do not encourage personal introspection or interpersonal relationships.

Desired Characteristics of Academic Planning

Within the framework of assumptions concerning general conditions,

we suggest five specific characteristics should be present in the academic planning process.

Assessment of fundamental values and assumptions. Any organization is built upon durable assumptions and values which may, in time, outgrow their relevance. The inability or unwillingness to reexamine these fundamental assumptions is often the most disabling weakness of large bureaucratic institutions. Thus an academic plan is of little real value unless it (1) provides for a process through which the institution's basic assumptions can be questioned, and (2) establishes alternative, sub-organizations for individuals with distinctly different values.

Specifically, any academic plan must consider the interaction between teacher and learner. Callan argues:

> One aspect of planning that has received very little attention is the assumption about the learning process itself. Every plan is either implicitly or explicitly (and it should be explicit, I believe) structured around some theory about how people learn and what conditions, delivery systems, programs, and institutions facilitate learning for different kinds of people.[1]

Planners cannot ignore the learning process. Despite the difficulties of understanding its precise nature, an academic plan which deals only with aggregate numbers of participants and programs, avoiding the confrontation with fundamentals of learning, is necessarily inadequate.

Operational objectives. The planning process should (1) determine specific and diverse institutional objectives, (2) candidly assess the

institution's ability to move toward these objectives, (3) project specific program additions and modifications through which the institution can better approach its objectives within available resources, and (4) insure the development of critical evaluative mechanisms which test the significance of existing programs and weigh the priority need for programmatic changes. Conceived in this manner, the plan can serve as a primary operational instrument which guides the institution's qualitative and quantitative development. The process is of little use if the plan is seen as an end rather than as a means--that is, if the result is simply a rhetorical device to satisfy the call for "better planning" by statewide agencies or by the general public.

Substantial work has been done in recent years which emphasizes the importance of societal, personal, and institutional goals and their relation to academic planning.[2] Palola notes that academic institutions engage in "goal evasion" and fail to look carefully at objectives, because once a college or university determines its goals beyond a rhetorical sense, it must examine its capabilities in approaching those goals.[3] The New Jersey Board of Higher Education writes that:

> the establishment of goals requires understanding and judgment. Goals must be based on a broad conception of the trends and development taking place in society. Goals necessarily reflect values and are therefore difficult to formulate. Nevertheless, the establishment of goals is the crucial step in the process and it is in the effort to reach the goals that all planning decisions are made.[4]

Work by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and others suggests that planners who contrast institutional objectives with actual performance should carefully examine the outcomes of existing programs.[5] Thoughtful planning can only occur if planners match outcomes desired by students with the actual outcomes of a student's experience within an institution. We continue to measure higher education in terms of simple inputs (e.g. faculty salaries, size of library, number of students, characteristics of entering students) rather than looking at qualitative outcomes of higher education.

Determination of priorities. With limited resources, any organization must determine its priorities for action. Such priorities must be flexible enough to adjust to changing social conditions and to evolving student needs, yet an academic plan which does not identify operational priorities necessarily offers little more than empty rhetoric.

Data Collection and Analysis. Meanirgful planning must be based upon sound research. Programs should not be justified merely by the labels, "high academic quality" or "prestigious". Rather, programs should be assessed by criteria which indicate relevance to student learning objectives and social utility. Though precise measures for such criteria may not exist, attempts to better understand the impact of particular academic programs should still be made. The growing literature on evaluation suggests that ways do exist to improve current programs. Additionally, there is evidence that the development of more diverse

learning opportunities would benefit many individuals.[6] Such scholarship should be included within the planning process.

Continuous and open process. Academic planning often occurs sporadically in response to demands by foundations, accrediting agencies, or governmental organizations. While such demands may be healthy, the academic institution should approach planning as a continuous process. Perhaps only structural dimensions of an institution should remain relatively static for significant periods of time. Operational aspects of the organization must continuously be questioned; planners should never assume that there is one optimal way of providing any service. Planning must involve ongoing evaluation, adjustment, and reevaluation.

Within any conceptual framework, academic planning should be seen as an open process which provides a supportive environment to raise and discuss diverse and conflicting questions. At a time when a significant number of individuals on campuses and in state capitols are focusing on the qualitative aspects of higher education, it is imperative that the planning process accommodate and encourage the expression of diverse viewpoints. Large multicampus bureaucracies have, by aggregating common values, made it more difficult for individuals to pursue alternative models of institutional development. Academic plans should explore alternative programmatic models for different campuses and within specific campuses.

Ultimately, an academic planning process must provide rationales and incentives for institutional self-renewal. Bennis and Slater[7] argue

that there are at least four essential elements which any academic organization must possess in order to sustain a process of revitalization:

- An ability to learn from experience and codify, store, and retrieve the relevant knowledge.
- An ability to learn how to learn, that is to develop methods for improving the learning process.
- An ability to acquire and use feedback mechanisms on performance, in short, to be self-analytical.
- An ability to direct one's destiny.

Unless the planning process provides incentives for performing these tasks, evaluation and development within campuses will not occur.

COMMENTS ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC PLAN, 1974-1978

Overview

The University of California document is an attempt by the University to recognize and adjust to changing conditions and to engage in comprehensive planning on a systemwide basis. While the document does communicate some sense that positive steps are being taken within the University, the Academic Plan is characterized by serious inadequacies.

Two general observations describe the University document.

- The planning process and the plan itself appear to accomplish a certain internally oriented political/managerial objective. The President's office has communicated to the campuses that more effective systemwide leadership must be assumed if the University is to respond to changing conditions. At a time when enrollments and resources were rapidly increasing, it was believed that the individual campuses should be given maximum flexibility. However, for at least the next two decades, enrollments and resources will not increase substantially and qualitative changes will continue to be urged by external and internal forces. Decisions will be made increasingly from a systemwide perspective. Provided that the University's planning efforts grow more sensitive to the qualitative need for greater diversity, this more comprehensive approach is desirable.

- Although the plan may achieve certain managerial objectives, the document is largely a description of the University's current programs and missions. It may be necessary to outline the institution's current activities so as to provide a basis from which to plan. Nevertheless, planning implies programmatic development, not simply an inventory of

> functions and specific programs. In many instances the University document more resembles a catalog than a plan.

The overall weakness of the document is not in what it says; the document is inadequate as a plan because of what the planning process and the product did not include. We offer commentary on and corresponding to specific sections of the Academic Plan.

Planning Objectives

There is a lack of clarity concerning the objectives of the planning process. The statement which most closely describes the plan's objectives notes that:

> The document does not attempt an exhaustive review of all aspects of the University's academic activities; rather, it focuses upon those features which require re-examination and, in some cases, reshaping to fit the needs of the 1970's. (p.2)

A plan which is to serve as a four-year guide should go beyond simply identifying program and policy areas which need to be examined. Such an identification process should be one of the initial tasks in the planning process, not the result of the process.

The basic disclaimer in the document is that the plan must be combined with the individual campus plans to have any meaning. In that the systemwide document has few operational components, we are confused. An array of individual campus plans which guide campuses independently appears contrary to the plan's internal managerial objective discussed above.

It may be desirable for multicampus university systems to emphasize the operational components of the planning effort in the individual campus plans. However, if the system is to have any clear direction, the systemwide plan must provide criteria by which the desirability and effectiveness of both objectives and actual outcomes of campus programs can be assessed. If the systemwide document does not provide such leadership, the directions of the campuses will be determined in an ill-planned and uncoordinated fashion. The University plan includes no criteria by which plans can be matched with desired statewide directions.

This plan does state three "academic planning objectives":

> 1. The University of California will strengthen its overall academic plannning and review process to assure that all university level programs of recognized scholarly and professional importance are presented somewhere within the institution; their distribution and development on the several campuses will be planned to achieve a total spectrum of University offerings of breadth and quality not attainable in a single campus institution of higher learning.
>
> 2. The University considers it imperative to preserve the intellectual vitality and dynamism of the mature campuses in their new steady-state conditions.
>
> 3. The University considers it equally imperative to continue strengthening the academic development of the growing campuses. (p.3)

All three "planning objectives" are broadly managerial in nature and relate closely to numbers. The objectives speak strictly to administrative decisions regarding leveling enrollments and resources.

Beyond adjusting to quantitative, steady-state conditions, the stated "planning objectives" deal with qualitative questions only through implicit and unchallenged assumptions. The implication of the third objective, "...to continue strengthening the academic development of the growing campuses," implies that present assumptions of academic quality and past patterns of development are totally valid and desirable.

The plan does not consider the goals of students, faculty members, or organizational units in determining the objectives of the planning process. There is considerable data available as a result of the survey of institutional goals prepared for the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education by Richard Peterson.[8] Moreover, the University of California, Los Angeles undertook an extensive and candid look at the rhetorical and actual operational goals of the institution through a campuswide Goals Committee.[9] The Committee assessed the institution's position relative to desirable goals and recommended substantial organizational and programmatic reforms. The University academic plan does not utilize this or other similar efforts to determine objectives or to move toward determined goals.

Assumptions

The section of the plan entitled "basic assumptions" (1) fails to distinguish between rhetorical assumptions and operational assumptions which do in fact impact on programmatic policy, (2) ignores evidence that challenges stated assumptions, and (3) specifies no evaluative

mechanism through which these assumptions could possibly be questioned.

For example, the first assumption states:

> The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active, working repository of organized knowledge. (p.5)

Inherent within the statement are the assumptions that (a) communicating knowledge can consistently be equated with meaningful learning, and (b) that this knowledge-broker function is the optimal way of providing "long-term societal benefits." Many argue that higher education can and should go beyond these traditional assumptions concerning advanced learning.

Knowledge is one component of the learning process; knowledge is not an end unto itself. If the University is both to offer instructional programs that are increasingly more meaningful to the individual student, and to provide research which is utilized in addressing society's short- and long-term problems and needs, the assumption that knowledge equals learning must be critically examined.

The University should not be redesigned to address all learning needs of all people. However, the University's current student and societal clientele can be better served if the institution would candidly question dominant assumptions related to learning.

The assumption that "the autonomy and independence of the University, which are essential to the excellence of the institution, will continue

to be respected and protected by the people of the State" ignores contemporary events and attitudes. Dressel[10] and Glenny[11] among others have developed ideas and data that challenge such traditional claims. Few argue that short-sighted intervention by state government will result in meaningful solutions to institutional problems. However, many realize that the state government-university interface is changing significantly. To rely only on descriptions of "autonomy and independence" is to ignore important changes in that relationship.

Another assumption concerning academic programs reads:

> The presence on a University campus of students of all levels--lower division through post-doctoral--contributes to a favorable learning environment for able and motivated students. (p.5)

This is contrary to the findings of the Joint Committee's study of research in public higher education by Lewis Mayhew.[12] Mood has argued that the presence of research and graduate training actually results in a substantial diversion of faculty resources to these activities, while these resources are justified by the presence of undergraduate students.[13]

There is an absence of explicit assumptions about the characteristics of a desirable learning environment. And there are no assumptions which suggest how the University should affect the student. What should the student learn? How can she/he best learn? How can the learning experiences within the University become more meaningful to the individual's emotional, attitudinal, and cognitive needs after leaving the institution?

These fundamental questions are not addressed.

Assessment of Current Environment

The plan's assessment of the current environment--"Prospects for the 1970's"--is adequate in outlining purely quantifiable trends related to population and fiscal resources. However, the primary emphasis on numbers again neglects the qualitative questions. If the systemwide academic plan does not even acknowledge questions related to substantive development, there is little possibility that incentives will exist at the campuses for examination and reform.

Planning Process

The University's academic planning process (p. 15) appears to insulate itself from differing perspectives. It is encouraging that the decision-making mechanism (Academic Planning and Program Review Board) included student and faculty members. It is, however, troubling that half of the membership and all four APPRB officers are members of the central administrative staff. There was no apparent input from individuals who have done extensive work in academic planning, from large numbers of students and faculty members, or from community members. We understand that the only communication the APPRB had with other individuals or groups was with the campus chancellors and that meetings on the campuses were not public sessions. The inbred and static nature of any organization is dependent upon its ability to isolate itself from

disagreement, conflict, and external influences. The University's planning process appears to be substantially insulated even from internal critics.

Program Areas

The bulk of the academic plan is found within the section entitled, "Some special concerns for the 1970's" (p. 23). This section also reflects the catalog-nature of the plan wherein activities are itemized and listed. The primary thrust of the section apparently is to describe the University's activities or operations in twelve areas. Problems are not candidly identified nor are alternative directions explored. There is an absence of humility and an incapacity to recognize weaknesses. The Plan proposes no means by which progress could be made in reducing inadequacies. We focus on three of the twelve program areas.

The sections discussing undergraduate education and graduate and professional education are particularly vague and do not consider criticism by educators or external critics. With regard to undergraduate education, five points which are pulled from a prior University report are mentioned as justification for the undergraduate program.

> 1. The University serves as a model or laboratory in which new modes of undergraduate education may by developed and tested.
>
> 2. Because of its dual responsibilities for undergraduate and graduate instruction, the University offers opportunities for direct undergraduate experience with research and scholarship not otherwise available.

3. The presence of good undergraduate programs is essential for successful operation of balanced graduate programs, so that graduate students may participate in supervised apprentice teaching.

4. Undergraduate and graduate education on the same campus interact in a number of other important ways. Joint work, consultation, and informal contacts among students of different levels enrich the experience and education of each group. Many high-cost campus resources can be more efficiently used on a campus which provides for the education of a full range of students.

5. Because of the need to provide opportunities for graduate students to attain greater breadth of preparation and to fill in some prerequisites, even a campus which served only graduate and professional students would find it necessary to teach certain courses at an upper division, undergraduate level. The use of such courses by undergraduates represents a real efficiency in the use of teaching time and facilities. (p. 28)

The first is simply an undocumented claim. The plan implies without documentation that many undergraduate students are involved in non-traditional instructional programs. Three of the remaining four points justify the program on the basis that the presence of undergraduates is of benefit to graduate students and other University programs. Justifying undergraduate programs by arguing that such programs provide services for other programs is curious and arguable at best.

The tone of the section demonstrates the attitude that existing undergraduate programs are very adequate, a notion contrary to the attitudes of many. A recently released statement by the statewide University of California Student Body Presidents' Council claims that the Univer-

sity's undergraduate program is marked by substantial deficiencies. Recommendations by national groups such as the Newman Task Force, statewide efforts such as the Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, and University reports such as those of the Muscatine and Kneller Committees have all urged significant reforms in undergraduate programs.[14]

Academic plans recently developed at other institutions have addressed substantive problems related to instructional programs. The State University of New York at Stony Brook recently released a self-study which was extremely candid in assessing programmatic weaknesses. "Stony Brook in Transition" should be of particular interest to university planners in that Stony Brook's programs, student body, and general characteristics are very similar to those of University of California campuses. The study, in examining undergraduate programs at the Stony Brook campus, emphasizes the following points which clearly contrast with the University of California's academic plan.

> Where expectations are matched, undergraduate education at Stony Brook is excellent (in comparison with the situation of mismatched expectations). It is a product of the interaction of bright young people motivated to study in a particular area of expertise and a knowledgeable faculty able and willing to assist these students in achieving their ends.
>
> Where the expectations are mismatched, undergraduate education at Stony Brook is not only weak but alienating for both students and faculty. The education is weak and alienating because both students and faculty are looking for something different

> from that which the other is giving. The lack of match is (mis)perceived on both sides as lack of interest in and insensitivity to that which is essentially important to the other.
>
> Student concern for personal growth has substantial impact upon the manner in which they learn. The packaging or the style of the education takes on major significance for them. Thus, large lectures which virtually preclude the possibility of a personal interaction of the teacher and the student's particular needs are perceived as impersonal, dehumanizing and perhaps even counterproductive.[15]

The section of the UC academic plan concerning graduate and professional education (p. 31) also appears to ignore current thinking and findings of major study groups concerned with graduate education. In "Scholarship for Society", the National Panel on Alternative Approaches to Graduate Education raised many questions, including the following three points:

> Alienation in the Student-Faculty Community. Particularly for graduate students with slight adult experience of nonacademic life and no opportunity for participation in team research in a lab or elsewhere, the period of graduate study often resembles a chamber of alienation...One harmful effect is the intensification of a sense of removal from societal concerns. Another is a failure to develop participational skills--a highly consequential failure in men and women of trained intellect. Still another is perception of graduate study, by the student, as an act of retreat or postponement rather than of present engagement.
>
> Toward a New Conception of Subject Matter. A number of disciplines are currently bound by convention, traditional forms and revered research.

> But insufficient attention is sometimes paid to the price of that process. The movement toward ever higher standards of professionalization has begun to obscure the meaning and uses of many areas of humanistic knowledge. And the tendency to dismiss as "unreal" areas originally excluded only because they appeared inconvenient for inquiry is evident throughout advanced study...
>
> Insuring Viable Futures. The current beleaguerment and crisis in graduate education stems in part from failures of awareness within the institutions themselves--insufficient alertness to trends in societal needs, employment opportunities... The problem in one of its dimensions can be stated as a question: How can advanced education communities be stimulated into long-range planning that simultaneously enhances diversity and commitment?

Such findings differ from the vague satisfaction reflected in the UC academic plan. In discussing one nontraditional idea--the teaching doctorate--the plan simply states, "The University is not convinced of the case for the Doctorate of Arts proposal." The plan's discussion reflects no immediate concern with inadequacies and includes no vigorous assessments of current programs. However, the fact that a university-wide committee was formed to review the Ph.D. is encouraging.

The section of the document concerned with "The Extended University" (p. 33) is more straightforward in specifying program objectives. We have some questions, however, related to the document's approach to evaluating progress toward specific objectives. The following paragraph speaks to this question:

> In addition to these objectives, it is expected that the close association between the University's full-time programs and the Extended University's part-time pilot programs will assure appropriate academic rigor and standards in new programs. Significant changes are expected to be effected over a period of time by way of constructive influences the new programs will have on the old.

Additional specifics concerning what "appropriate academic rigor and standards" actually include and whether or not traditional measures are meaningful in evaluating nontraditional programs are issues not addressed within the document. Such assumptions preferably would be challenged throughout the planning process.

Campus Profiles

We are confused over the purpose of the final section of the plan entitled "Campus Profiles" (p. 52). The degree program inventory (p. 82) is a useful tool in identifying existing programs. However, in describing campus programs and the "academic thrust" of individual institutions no qualitative distinctions or differentiations between campuses are made. The campus profiles repeatedly justify claims that academic programs are of "outstanding quality" by simply mentioning the Roose and Anderson ratings for the American Council on Education. National reports (by the Newman Task Force on Higher Education and others) have argued that reliance on only these traditional ratings is undesirable. These ratings are based upon the prestige and reputation of faculty members' academic

research efforts. Criteria measuring quality should be more related to factors which affect the diverse learning needs of diverse groups of individual students. To judge institutions only upon the research accomplishments of faculty results in sharply narrowing the legitimate purposes of institutions and the behavior of those who seek to achieve narrowly defined measures of excellence. It should be noted that the academic plans of the individual campuses have yet to be developed, and that the campus profiles were not intended to be fully comprehensive statements.

Conclusion

We want to emphasize that many ideas have been developed which explore desirable characteristics of academic planning. Academic planners should be strong enough to question their traditional values and assumptions and to be candid in articulating institutional weaknesses. Because an institution has been great in the past does not mean that standards of excellence are timeless or that institutions should continue to neglect their weaknesses.

Departures from traditional assumptions and programs are needed. The academic planning process should not be solely concerned with quantifiable changes. Certainly universities must make managerial adjustments to shifts in enrollments and resources; however, human learning involves much, much more than numbers.

Academic planners must develop the conceptual framework and specific incentives whereby institutions can begin to match the diverse

learning needs of individuals with diverse learning opportunities. Educational planning should not be affected only by quantifiable conditions. Individuals seeking learning experiences are changing along with contemporary ideas on what and how individuals learn.

The University's evident desire to approach planning on a comprehensive basis is encouraging and should lead to significant changes. Beyond this initial step, improvement in the planning process is necessary if the results of the process are to have significant meaning and impact on the individual student and the people of the state. Our commentary is offered in the hope and spirit that we can improve planning through a cooperative effort.

Appendix

Summary of University of California Academic Plan

The Academic Plan is presented in several sections. The following is a brief summary of these sections.

Introduction (page 2)

University of California Academic Plan, 1974-78, is intended to be a planning document which indicates adjustment by the University to "changing conditions" and "new expectations". The Academic Plan is not designed to be in itself an operational plan. Proposals and specific recommendations concerning academic programs will be contained in planning documents of the individual campuses.

University Planning Objectives for the 1970's (3-4)

The document states that the University was a "pioneer" in developing the multi-campus concept. While the "era of physical expansion has passed," the document states three academic planning objectives which are designed to be the means for the University to "maintain its position at the forefront of the pursuit and transmission of knowledge". The University's planning objectives stated briefly are: (1) to strengthen overall academic planning and review processes, (2) to "preserve the intellectual vitality and dynamism of the mature campuses", and (3) to "continue strengthening the academic development of the growing campuses".

Basic Assumptions (5-7)

This section states some eighteen "basic assumptions about circumstances and policies". Included are these: (1) "the distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning...through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active, working repository of organized knowledge", (2) "differentiation of function among the three public segments of higher education in California will continue in substantially its present form", (3) "diversification among the several campuses will continue to be encouraged", (4) "the University will continue to respond to the public's desire for increased opportunities to pursue degree

programs on a part-time basis...", (5) "...the University must maintain its ability to respond to changing needs."

Prospects for the 1970's (8-14)

This section attempts to discuss the characteristics of "primary changes affecting the environment and the planning needs of the University". In examining enrollment trends, the document notes that in the 1960's enrollment grew some 119 percent. For the 1970's, overall growth will slow to about 20 percent. In 1980, the number of high school graduates is projected to be less than the previous year. The document notes that the proportion of students seeking a traditional postsecondary education as well as student fee levels may change, and both factors may affect current enrollment projections. In examining the fiscal outlook, the Academic Plan indicates that instructional support per student has declined 27 percent from $2830 to $2080 between 1960-61 to 1973-74 (in 1972-73 dollars). The section states that "state legislators are besieged by pressures to meet other social needs with high priorities". The document continues, "this means that the University will return invaluable economic and social benefits in exchange for the State's investment".

Academic Planning and Program Review Processes (15-22)

Planning and program review responsibilities are assigned to the Academic Planning and Program Review Board. The Board is composed of seven systemwide administrators, four faculty members, and three students. The section outlines a three-stage planning process which seeks to provide overall direction from the systemwide Board through coordination of individual campus plans. Procedures for review of academic programs are specified.

Some Special Concerns for the 1970's (23-51)

The stated intent of the section is to discuss "some of the particular problems and policies of the University in a number of different areas that will need attention in the decade of the 1970's." The subsections which describe various programmatic areas are not designed to be detailed discussions. The campus academic plans "will have more to say regarding many of these topics." The following topics are described:

-The University's public service activities
-Broader clientele
-Faculty
-Undergraduate education
-Graduate and professional education
-Extended university
-University extension
-Research
-Libraries
-Computer resources
-Agricultural sciences
-Health

Campus Profiles (52-80)

Profiles of campus activities and brief discussions of UC's three Atomic Energy Commission laboratories are included. The campus profiles are characterized as "descriptive and preliminary". More thorough campus plans are being developed. The profiles generally identify enrollment characteristics including a listing of PhD programs offered, and include a section entitled "academic thrust".

Appendices (81-107)

The final section of the Academic Plan includes an inventory of degree programs listed by campus and academic area, and a listing of organized research units by campus.

NOTES

1. Callan; "Statement to the California Postsecondary Education Commission", January 21, 1974.

2. See among other works: Katz et al; No time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College Students, 1968. Mayhew; Contemporary College Students and the Curriculum, Southern Regional Education Board, 1969. Sanford; Colleges Today and Tomorrow, 1970.

3. Palola and Padgett; Planning for Self-Renewal, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California Berkeley, 1971.

4. New Jersey Board of Higher Education; Goals for Higher Education, New Jersey, New Jersey Department of Higher Education, January, 1970. See also: Trivett; Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions, American Association for Higher Education and ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1973.

5. Micek and Arney (WICHE); Outcome-Oriented Planning in Higher Education: An Approach or an Impossibility? 1973. See also: Bayer et al; Four Years After College Entry, American Council on Education, 1973.

6. See among others: Less Time, More Options (1971), Reform on Campus (1972), and Toward a Learning Society (1973), reports of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Martin; Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California, Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1972. Select Commission on Nontraditional Study; "Dynamics of Change: Alternative Educational Opportunities", Council on Higher Education, State of Washington, 1974. Lenning; The "Benefits Crisis in Higher Education, American Association of Higher Education, 1974. "Interest in Alternative Higher Education Programs Among University of California Undergraduates", Office of the Vice-President, Extended Academic and Public Service Programs, University of California, 1974.

7. Bennis and Slater; The Temporary Society, 1968. See also: Suslow and Jedamus; Evaluating Institutions for Accountability, 1974.

8. Peterson; Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities, Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

9. Report of the UCLA Goals Committee, Office of the Chancellor, 1972.

10. Dressel; Return to Responsibility, 1971.

11. Glenny and Daglish; Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California Berkeley, 1973.

12. Mayhew; The Role of Research in California Higher Education, Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, 1973.

13. Mood et al; "Allocation of a University's Resources to Instruction", in Papers on Efficiency in the Management of Higher Education, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1972.

14. University of California Student Body Presidents' Council, "Seeking Reform Within the University", 1974. Report on Higher Education (1971) and National Policy and Higher Education (1973), reports to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by task forces chaired by Frank Newman. Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education; "The California Master Plan for Higher Education in the Seventies and Beyond," 1972. Muscatine et al, Education at Berkeley, Academic Senate, UC Berkeley, 1968. Kneller et al, "The Kneller Report", Academic Senate, UCLA, 1968.

15. "Stony Brook in Transition", Office of the Academic Vice-President, State University of New York, Stony Brook, 1974. See also: "Academic and Nonacademic Student Life at Stony Brook", SUNY Stony Brook, 1973.

16. Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education, Scholarship for Society, 1973.